

D<sup>1</sup> up from about 3% to about 87% by weight of the total of the crystal modifier and the organic solvent in the dispersion, and the wax dispersant being present in the dispersion in the amount sufficient to impart at least meta-stability to the dispersion, and the dispersion having a viscosity at 25°C of less than about 50,000 centipoise.

D<sup>2</sup> 11. (Amended) An aqueous external dispersion as set forth in claim 10 wherein the organic [crystal modifier composition further comprises] solvent is an aromatic hydrocarbon solvent.

D<sup>3</sup> 16. (Amended) An aqueous external dispersion as set forth in claim 11 wherein the dispersion contains [from 0] up to about 50% by weight aromatic hydrocarbon solvent.

D<sup>4</sup> 26. (Twice Amended) A method as set forth in claim 25 wherein the organic [crystal modifier composition further comprises] solvent is an aromatic hydrocarbon solvent.

D<sup>5</sup> 31. (Twice Amended) A method as set forth in claim 26 wherein the dispersion contains [from 0] up to about 50% by weight aromatic hydrocarbon solvent.

Please cancel Claims 39 and 41.

#### Remarks

The previously-filed Amendment and Response "B" were not entered due to the Examiner's position that 35 U.S.C. §112 issues are raised by the language in certain dependent claims calling for the compositions that already call for an organic solvent to "further comprise" an aromatic hydrocarbon solvent. The present Amendment and Response "C" is believed to obviate the Examiner's concerns, as will be discussed below.

As noted in Amendment and Response "B", in the subject Office Action, it is stated that Claims 39 and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is submitted that Claim 1, as amended, and Claim 17 correspond to original Claims 39 and 41 but do not depend from a rejected claim and so should